

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 13-26, 30-36 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 14, 17, 18, 31 and 34 are independent. Claims 1, 5, 8, 13-14, 16-18, 30-31, and 33-34 have been amended. Claims 35 and 36 have been added. Reconsideration of the action mailed November 14, 2006 is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,256 ("Wu").

Claim 1. The examiner rejected claim 1, stating that

... Wu teaches generating a plurality of views of the document for display in a single display environment, two or more of the views being based on different color palettes, the plurality of views including a document view and an object view, the document view including each of the plurality of color containing objects, and the object view including one of the plurality of color containing objects, wherein a display of the document view in the display environment involves rendering the color containing objects in the document view using the document color palette, and wherein a display of the object view in the display environment involves rendering the one color containing object in the object view using an object color palette associated with the object view.

(See, Wu, independent claim 1, stating in part: "translating the plurality of images from respective formats to the supported image format, and outputting a translated document, the translated document including at least a reference to the color palette ..." See also, Wu, Figure 6 and dependent claims 4 and 10.

The "document view" is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where "each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette." See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a "document view" may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The "object view" is disclosed as "based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object" See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the "object view" is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line, 7 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target

device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself. ...)

Wu discloses a method of translating a document on a first device for use on a second device. In Wu, the translating of the document involves “translating the plurality of images [referenced by the document] from respective [image] formats to [an image format supported by the second device]” (see col. 20, lines 18-20) and “outputting a translated document ... including at least a reference to the color palette [for the second device], [and] the plurality of images in the supported image format....” (see col. 20, lines 21-24).

The examiner appears to take the position that the pre-translated document corresponds to the “document view” and the post-translated document corresponds to the “object view.” Even with such correspondence, nothing in Wu teaches or suggests “generating a document color palette for all or a portion of an electronic document, the colors of the document color palette being selected based on colors of a plurality of color-containing objects in the document or portion thereof; generating a first object color palette for a first color-containing object of the plurality, the colors of the first object color palette being selected based on colors of the first color-containing object; generating both a document view and an object view for the first color-containing object, the document view being based on the document color palette, and the object view being based on the first object color palette; and storing both the document view and the object view for the first color-containing object in the document,” as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 should be allowed. Amended claim 18 has limitations corresponding to the limitations of claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 14. The examiner rejected claim 14, stating that

Wu teaches: A method for rendering an image in a display environment, the method including: receiving an electronic document including multiple views

for each of a plurality of graphics objects of the electronic document, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views for rendering in a single display environment, a first view for each graphics object being based on a color palette for the graphics object and the second view for each graphics object being based on a document color palette for an associated portion of the electronic document; and rendering the portion of the electronic document according to the second view of each of the plurality of graphics objects.

(See, Wu, col. 19, lines 16-67, teaching and intranet environment and an off-line environment where the originating data is stored and then later translated and saved to a separate files for use by different target users. The server stores both "views" of the document and renders the translated document to the target user. The "document view" is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where "each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette." See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a "document view" may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The "object view" is disclosed as "based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object" See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the "object view" is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line, 7 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself...)

Claim 14, as amended, recites: "receiving an electronic document including a plurality of graphics objects, each graphics object being associated with a page of the electronic document, the electronic document including multiple views for each of the plurality of graphics objects, the multiple views being based on different color palettes, the multiple views including a first view that is based on an object color palette for the graphics object and a second view for each graphics object that is based on a document color palette for the page of the electronic document with which the graphics object is associated; and rendering a page of the electronic document

according to the second view of each of the plurality of graphics objects associated with the page."

Nothing in Wu teaches or suggests an electronic document that includes multiple views for each of the plurality of graphics objects, the multiple views being based on different color palettes. Further, nothing in Wu teaches or suggests that that each graphics object has a view that is based on a document color palette for the page of the electronic document with which the graphics object is associated. In Wu, the translated document includes only one view for each image, where the views of all of the images of the translated document are based on the single color palette for the target device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 14 should be allowed. Amended claim 31 has limitations corresponding to the limitations of claim 14 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 17. The examiner rejected claim 14, stating that

Wu teaches: A method for configuring at least a portion of a document for display in a display environment, the method including: receiving an electronic document including multiple graphics objects; and generating a display document including multiple views of each of the multiple graphics objects, the multiple views for display in a single display environment, each view of the multiple views based on a different color palette and representing a different portion of the electronic document.

(See, Wu, dependent claim 8, teaching specifically the generation and rendering of graphics drawing elements. See also, Wu, dependent claim 12, teaching that the translated document contains graphics elements. The "document view" is disclosed as the each of the plurality of color containing objects, where "each color containing object in the document view is represented using the document color palette." See, disclosure, page 2, lines 20-21. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, a "document view" may be an original document. See, Wu, col. 5, line 12 through col. 6, line 7, teaching that an original document is loaded with the original color specification. The original document is the document view.

The "object view" is disclosed as "based on a corresponding object color palette of the corresponding graphics object, and each object color palette includes a set of colors optimized for the corresponding graphics object" See, disclosure, page 3, lines 8-10. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the

"object view" is any object for which the colors have been adapted for optimization of the object. See, Wu, col. 5, line, 7 through col. 6, line 16, teaching that the colors for an object are optimized based on the parameters of the target device. The target device is the justification for the optimization and defines its parameters. Merely because the object is optimized based on the parameters of the device in which it will ultimately be displayed, does not negate the optimization itself...)

Claim 17, as amended recites: "receiving an electronic document including multiple graphics objects; and generating a display document including multiple views of each of the multiple graphics objects, the multiple views for display in a display environment, each view of the multiple views based on a different color palette and representing a different portion of the electronic document."

In Wu, each image in a document to be displayed on a first target device is represented by a view that is based on a single color palette generated for the first target device, and each image in a document to be displayed on a second target device is represented by a view that is based on a single color palette generated for the second target device. Although the views of images in a document to be displayed on two different target devices may be based on different color palettes, nothing in Wu teaches or suggests that a single document includes multiple views of each of the multiple graphics objects, the multiple views for display in a display environment, each view of the multiple views based on a different color palette, as recited in the amended claim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 17 should be allowed. Amended claim 34 has limitations corresponding to the limitations of claim 17 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-11, 13, 15, 16, 19-26, 30, 32, 33, 35, and 36

All of the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to the claims from which they depend.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicants do not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicants' arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No 07844-594001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/14/07

Customer No. 21876
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906



Mandy Lebang
Reg. No. 45,884